



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 1039 White Oak Drive  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-21-144  
**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021 deferred since April 14, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Oakland City Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4A/Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1929

**Property Location:** West of Lee Street and East of Peeples Street

**Contributing (Y/N):** Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Queen Ann Cottage

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Exterior Alterations

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20M

**Deferred Application (Y/N):** Yes

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** Stop work order was issued on 2/25/21 for working without proper permits.

### SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20, Chapter 20M of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

## **Updates in Red**

### **PURVIEW**

#### **COMPATIBILITY STANDARD**

The Compatibility rule will govern this body of work and read as such “where quantifiable (i.e. building height, setback, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be no less than the smallest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure and shall be no greater than the greatest such element or building characteristic of buildings or site layouts in that block face that characterizes such like contributing buildings or site layouts and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure. Where not quantifiable (roof form, architectural trim, etc.), the element or building characteristic in question shall be compatible with that which predominates in such like contributing structures on that block face and shall be internally consistent with the historic design of the structure.”

#### **ALTERATIONS**

The Applicant has provided more detailed elevations that list what has happened and what is proposed for this property. As well, more photos have been provided.

#### **Roof**

The Applicant has indicated the front roof line was repaired. Research shows a roof that was in despair and rotten. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

The Applicant has indicated the roof was re-shingled. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

#### **Chimneys**

Historical evidence shows the house had two chimneys, however, the Applicant has not placed them on the elevations. Staff recommends the chimney remain on the house and be shown on the elevations.

#### **Porch**

The Applicant proposes to replace the handrail and spindles on the existing structure. The Applicant has indicated the handrail and spindles are rotten. No photos of the existing handrail and spindles have been presented. The Applicant has shown the replacement spindles. Staff deems if the replacement replicates what was there prior, this proposal is not problematic. Staff recommends the spindles be a two-part head butt construction with railings no higher than the sill on the front window. Any need to meet the code shall be done with a plain extension.

#### **Railings**

Recent photos have been provided and show uniquely pattern porch railings. The Applicant has indicated once again the railings will be replaced in-kind to the existing railings. And the photos provided by the Applicant show an exact match of the railings to the existing porch railings. Additionally, the Applicant has indicated the manner of installation will be a two-part head butt construction with railings no higher than the sill of the front window. Staff has no concern with this proposal.

### Columns

The Applicant proposes to replace the existing columns to match the columns there prior. Photos show the columns in good shape. Staff is not concerned with the proposal; however, Staff recommends the columns be repaired if need be. If any of the columns need replacing, the Applicant should provide photographic evidence demonstrating the need to be replaced.

### Porch flooring

Further research has provided information that the front porch was replaced incorrectly. Currently the porch is parallel to the front façade. Staff recommends the porch flooring be perpendicular to front façade and have a tongue and groove installation.

### Windows

The windows have been replaced on the house. The Applicant has indicated the replacement was done in-kind to match the existing wood two-over-one with wood trim. Research shows the original windows were wood two-over-one with wood trim. On the front the top of window there is molding. Staff recommends the Applicant install molding on front windows to match what was there originally. Photos also indicates, wood molding on the side windows. Staff recommends moldings be on all the windows as before.

On the right elevation, the Applicant has indicated, the window closes to the rear was changed to 5 feet instead of 6 feet due to a kitchen installation. District regulations states, “replacement windows units shall maintain the size and shape of the original window opening.” This means, the Applicant must return the window back to 6 feet. Staff recommends the Applicant does so.

### Door

Photo show a transom over the front door. Staff recommend that transom remains and be placed on the elevations. Right now, it is missing. Staff also recommends the front door be wood panel or fix glass in wood frame to meet the District regulations.

### Deck

The proposed deck is in the rear of the house and will meet the setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### Fence

The site plan shows a fence replacement which will be at the rear of the property. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.**

1. Both chimneys shall remain on the house and be shown on the elevations, per Sec. 16-20M.001;
2. Porch columns shall be repaired to match the original. If replacement is warranted, the Applicant shall provide photographic evidence to Staff to justify the replacement and replace to match the original, per Sec.16-20M.13(2)(i);
3. The porch floor shall be perpendicular with a tongue and groove construction, per Sec.16-20M.13(2)(i);
4. Wood molding shall be installed on all windows to match the original wood molding, per Sec.16-20M.013(2)(o)(1);

CA2-21-144 for 1039 White Oak  
May 12, 2021

5. The window on the right elevation shall be return to 6 feet to meet the District regulation, per Sec. Sec.16-20M.013(2)(o)(1)
6. The transom over the front door shall remain and the front door shall be wood panel or fixed glass in wood frame, per Sec. 16-20M.013(2)(r)(5) and
7. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

OFFICE OF DESIGN  
Kevin Bacon  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 171 Auburn (3 Piedmont)  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-21-223  
**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021 deferred since May 26, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Martin Luther King's Landmark District (subarea 4) **Other Zoning:** Beltline

**Date of Construction** Modern Building

**Property Location:** West of Edgewood and East of Auburn

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Commercial Building

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Signage proposal.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior work

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20C and Sec.16-28A.010

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance

## **SIGNAGE**

The Applicant proposes to install signage on the existing historic building. Section 16-20C.008(3)(e) and Section 16-28A.010 will govern over the requirements for the signage. In addition to the mention sections, the SPI-I requirements will apply to this proposal.

The Applicant is rebranding and switching out the signs. The existing signage will be removed and replaced with the proposed signage. Still, the Applicant will have three signs: two on the building, one projecting and one on the side of the building. The proposed projecting sign will be 12 feet above the sidewalk and protrude 3 feet from the building. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

cc: Applicant

Neighborhood

File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 1824 Piedmont Rd. (Rock Springs Presbyterian Church)

**APPLICATION:** CA2-21-238

**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Landmark Building/Site      **Other Zoning:** R-4 / Beltline.

**Date of Construction:** 1923

**Property Location:** West block face of Piedmont Ave., south of the Rock Springs Rd. intersection.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes.

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** English/Tudor Vernacular Revival.

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Alterations, signage, site work.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Ordinary repairs/maintenance, Painting.

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20      **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The requirements of Chapter 20 contain both qualitative and quantitative regulations for the treatment of landmark buildings. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the related regulations were met.

The Applicant is proposing Several alterations to the structure. Included in the work are some basic repairs and repainting which are not subject to a review by the Commission or Staff. In addition to this work, the Applicant proposes a new fence, alterations to the existing signage, the installation of new windows, and the installation of new paving and a parking lot. Staff has no concerns with the fence or signage work. Staff would recommend that the proposed fence allow for pedestrian access from the Piedmont St. frontage. With regard to the windows, Staff has no general concerns with the design of the work as the façade in question is secondary and would not be visible from the public right of way.

The site work proposed would involve the removal of the existing driveway, re-routing traffic to the proposed driveway for the single-family developments to the south and west of the site and installing surface parking to the west of the historic structure. The work will also include the conversion of two playgrounds into a garden and seating areas. Staff has no general concerns with the work proposed, but would recommend the Applicant ensure a sidewalk along Piedmont Rd. is installed where the driveway is being removed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions**

1. The proposed fence shall allow for pedestrian access from the Piedmont St. frontage;
2. The Applicant shall ensure a sidewalk along Piedmont Rd. is installed where the driveway is being removed;  
and,
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File





# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 821 Oakdale Rd.  
**APPLICATION:** CA2-21-251  
**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Druid Hills Landmark District      **Other Zoning:** N/A

**Date of Construction:** 1920, District Inventory; renovated c.1999 & 2018

**Property Location:** East block face of Oakdale Rd., north of the Ponce De Leon Ave. intersection.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes. **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Colonial Revival Style Elements

### **Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:**

- Replacement of driveway
- Installation of stucco retaining wall with limestone cap

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** N/A

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B      **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20B of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

Driveway replacement

The Applicant is proposing the replacement of the non-historic driveway installed as part of the 2018 renovations. The driveway will be shifted south 18" to allow for the preservation of a mature 26" DBH Oak at the northeast corner of the driveway on a neighbor's property. While the project would slightly alter the driveway pattern of the property, Staff finds that the proposal is acceptable in order to preserve the mature tree which could otherwise be destroyed.

Retaining wall

The Applicant is proposing the installation of a stucco faced retaining wall on the southern portion of the driveway which would wrap around the Oakdale Rd. frontage of the property approximately 32 feet. Per the District regulations, retaining walls are permitted in the District provided that retaining walls exist on the block face. Staff finds evidence of one stone retaining wall further south on the eastern block face of Oakdale Rd. The District regulations also stipulate that the retaining wall can be no taller than the highest point of the existing retaining walls on the block face or no taller than necessary to address the grade issues. Given that the existence of retaining walls on the block face and that the retaining wall appears to be no taller than would be necessary to address the grade issues on the property, Staff finds both these standards have been met.

However, Staff has some concerns with the design of the retaining wall. The work would involve the removal of the existing flagstone steps at the front of the property. While it is unclear whether the steps are original to the property, Staff finds that they appear to have been installed more than 50 years earlier than the date of this application. Additionally, Staff finds that the installation of the retaining wall for the full 32' proposed by the applicant would drastically alter the grade of the property. As part of an Olmstead planned neighborhood, grade changes are intentional design choices set at the time of construction. As such, Staff finds that altering the grade as much as is proposed would alter the spatial relationships that define the property.

Given these concerns, Staff has the following recommendations. Firstly, Staff recommends the retaining wall be shortened to address only the grade change at the southeast corner of the new driveway. Lastly, Staff recommends the stone steps at the front of the property be retained.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:**

1. The retaining wall shall be shortened to address only the grade change at the southeast corner of the new driveway, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(b);
2. The stone steps at the front of the property shall be retained, per Sec. 16-20B.003(1)(d); and,
3. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 688 Woodward Ave.  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-21-255  
**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Grant Park Historic District (Subarea 1)

**Other Zoning:** R-5 / Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** North block face of Woodward Ave., east of the Cameron St. intersection.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes.

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Victorian bungalow.

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Window, siding, and door replacement

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Work on the side and rear façades.

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20K of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The District regulations contain both qualitative and quantitative requirements for alterations to contributing structures. If an item is not discussed below, Staff found the related requirements were met.

The District regulations only give the Commission and Staff purview over the street facing façades of a structure. For the subject property, this would be the front façade. As such, Staff will limit the commentary to only the portions of the project proposed for the front façade.

**Window replacement**

From the photographs provided, Staff cannot see damage to the front façade windows which would not be repairable using accepted preservation based methods. As such, Staff cannot support their removal and replacement. Staff recommends the front façade windows be retained and repaired in-kind.

**Door replacement**

From the photographs provided, Staff finds that the existing front door is not the original front door and does not appear to be historic in nature. As such, Staff has no concerns with its removal. Staff recommends any replacement front door be wood with a rectangular lite opening no less than ½ the length of the slab.

**Siding replacement**

From the photographs provided Staff can see no damage that would require the wholesale replacement of the historic wood siding. As such, Staff cannot support its replacement. Staff recommends the historic wood siding be retained and repaired in-kind.

**Porch ceiling**

From the photographs provided, Staff finds that portions of the porch ceiling are in disrepair and in need of replacement. Staff recommends that any porch ceiling replacement be done in-kind with regard to materials and style.

**Porch railing**

The Applicant is proposing replacement of the existing non-historic porch railing. Staff recommends any new porch railing be constructed using a two-part butt-joint construction with the top rail placed no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows. Staff further recommends any additional rail height needed to meet life safety code be achieved through a simple plane extension of the top rail.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:**

1. The front façade windows shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D);
2. Any replacement front door shall be wood with a rectangular lite opening no less than ½ the length of the slab
3. The historic wood siding shall be retained and repaired in-kind, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D);
4. Any porch ceiling replacement shall be done in-kind with regard to materials and style, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D);
5. New porch railing shall be constructed using a two-part butt-joint construction with the top rail placed no higher than the bottom sill of the front façade windows, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D);
6. Any additional rail height needed to meet life safety code shall be achieved through a simple plane extension of the top rail, per Sec. 16-20K.007(D); and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



## CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
5 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of  
Design

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESSES:** 2625 Baker Ridge Road, NW

**APPLICATIONS:** CA3-21-153

**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Collier Heights Historic District    **Other Zoning:** R-4

**Date of Construction:** 1950s

**Property Location:** Northwest side of Baker Ridge

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** American Small House

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** All site work, exterior alterations, and additions.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interiors.

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20Q

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** Yes.    **Previous Applications/Known Issues:** None.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** **Deferral to the April 28, 2021 Commission meeting.**

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20Q.

**Documentation:**

The existing elevations do not match the existing conditions on the house, including but not limited to: the placement of the front door, front door stoop foundation (or lack thereof), front stoop roof, placement and number of front façade windows, attached lower level garage, foundation height / exposure, front terrace / “porch” foundation, left side gable vent, and left side window placement and number. The Staff would recommend the existing elevations accurately reflect the existing conditions at the site and the proposed elevations accurately reflect the proposed conditions.

It is not clear what renovations will occur to the existing house, though notes have been added regarding roof, windows and siding. The Staff would recommend that complete renovation notes and/or a narrative for the existing house be added to the plans, particularly to the existing and proposed elevations.

**Site Controls:**

Incomplete floor area ratio and lot coverage calculations are included in the plans. The Staff would recommend the plans clearly indicate the proposed floor area ratio and lot coverage.

No compatibility rule information was included for the rear yard setback. The Staff would recommend the plans include rear yard compatibility rule information.

**Site Plan Comments:**

No updated site plan was included in the revised permit drawings submitted to the Staff. In the previous version, there appears to be changes to the driveway, retaining wall and walkway that might be warranted due to their deterioration / condition. The Staff would recommend the plans reflect any site features work or specifically state that no such work will occur.

**Architectural Comments:**

The location, side yard setbacks, shape, and roof line / shape of the addition meet the District regulations. The plans now include a note indicating compliance with the compatibility rule, but the actual graphics and notes don't indicate how they will comply with the compatibility rule. Further, as noted above there is no compatibility rule information included to assess the proposed work. For example, the window material is based on the compatibility rule, so the Staff cannot assess whether the proposed vinyl windows (on the existing house or the addition) comply with the District regulations. The Staff would recommend that for the proposed addition, the plans indicate the specific window designs and materials, siding material, and foundation material and that those elements meet the compatibility rule requirements.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral to the June 23, 2021 Commission meeting to allow time for the Applicant to address the following comments / concerns:**

1. The existing elevations shall accurately reflect the existing conditions at the site and the proposed elevations shall accurately reflect the proposed conditions;
2. Complete renovation notes and/or a narrative for the existing house shall be added to the plans, particularly to the existing and proposed elevations;
3. The plans shall clearly indicate the proposed floor area ratio and lot coverage;
4. The plans shall include rear yard compatibility rule information, per Section 16-20Q.006(1);
5. The plans shall reflect any site features work or shall specifically state that no such work will occur, per Section 16-20Q.006;
6. The plans shall indicate for the proposed addition the specific window designs and materials, siding material, and foundation material and that those elements meet the compatibility rule requirements, per Section 16-20Q.006; and
7. The revised plans and supporting documentation shall be submitted to the Staff at least 8 days prior to the meeting to which this application is deferred.

Cc: File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

**KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS**  
**MAYOR**

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

**TIM KEANE**  
**Commissioner**

**OFFICE OF DESIGN**  
**Kevin Bacon**  
**Director**

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 843 Springdale Road

**APPLICATION:** CA3-21-226-Alterations

**MEETING DATE:** May 26, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Druid Hills Landmark District      **Other Zoning:** N/A

**Date of Construction:** 1925

**Property Location:** West of Ponce de Leon Avenue and East North Decatur Road

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes,      **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Tudor

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Additions, Alterations and Sitework

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** N/A

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20B.

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with Conditions



**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20B of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

All four sides of the structure will be reviewed. The Applicant proposes many detail enhancements and additions to the existing structure. Staff review is based of Sec.16-28B.003(12) District guiding principal which states, "Minimum architectural controls: Any new construction, additions, renovations or alterations in the District shall maintain the general architectural scale and character reflected in the original development of Druid Hills in order to preserve the historic character of the district and shall follow the standards set forth" Staff also relied on Sec. 16-28B.003(1)(j), which states, "new additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

### **ADDITION**

The Applicant proposes an addition at the rear of the house which will include the basement level, a garage and covered terrace and screen porch. The addition will also be inclusive of a family room, screened porch and terrace. The attic will be finished to allow for playroom, guest bedroom and storage. The total renovated house & addition will be 15,140 SF. The Applicant is meeting the District requirement of 35%. Additionally, the setbacks are met. The addition's roofline disappears nicely into the existing structure. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### Arched Openings and Heath

The Applicant proposes four Todor stone arched openings on the new addition on the basement level. A gas raised stone heath will be placed in one of the arches. The architectural details for the stone arches and the heath are scale for a house built in this style and time period. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### Siding

A brick veneer will be installed to match the existing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### Windows and Garage

The prevailing proposed window is a steel & glass window with stone lintel over many if not all the windows. From the plans, this window is a window type that matches the window pattern on the existing house. Stone Jack arches will be applied to garage. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### Roof

A new slate roof to match is proposed by the Applicant for the new addition. Flashing will be applied to gable where it meets the existing house. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### Chimney

The proposed brick chimney will have a decorative pattern with a stone cap and clay chimney pots. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### Stairs

The declining stairs on the back will have 34 inches iron handrail with custom pickets and stone treads/steps and risers on CMU. Staff is not concerned with his proposal.

## **SHED DORMER**

The Applicant proposes a new shed dormer on the left elevation with a 3/12 pitch that sits directly behind the steep double Tudor dormer. The visibility is so minimal, it's impact will not be significant. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **ALTERATIONS**

The following alterations have been proposed: casement windows replacement, new front door, new door and side lites, window replacements

### Windows

The Applicant proposed new casement windows with a similar pattern as the existing. Other proposed windows are steel windows. Staff is not concern with this proposal.

### Doors

The Applicant proposes to install a new steel door in the existing stone opening. The door window patterns match the windows on the existing house. Additionally, a proposal for a steel door and sidelites are proposed. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

## **GENERAL REPAIRS**

Along with the additions and alterations, the Applicant proposes general repairs: replacement of all gutters, repairing attic vents. Staff is not concerned with any general repairs on the existing structure.

## **SITE WORK**

### Pool and Pool house

The proposed poo and pool house are not problematic. It meets the required setbacks. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### Retaining Wall

An 8 feet stone retaining wall is proposed in the left rear elevation. District regulation permits retaining walls only if retaining are on the block face and wall shall be no taller than retaining wall on the blockface or the minimum height required to retain the adjacent grade. The Applicant has stated and shown that 8 feet is required to satisfy the steep drop-off of the grade. With this being at the rear of the property the 8 feet retaining wall is not problematic.

### Masonry Steps

The masonry step would not be problematic.

### Walkway

The Applicant proposes to remove a walkway in the front of the house. This is not problematic to Staff. The District regulations states that landscape requirement is to "retain any historic circulation system including driveways, walkways and paths." The Applicant has shown the walkway was not original to the circulation. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

### Driveway

The proposal for the renovation of the driveway is not problematic to Staff.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

CA3-21-225 for 843 Springdale

May 26, 2021

Page 4 of 4

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 950 Austin  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-21-235  
**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Inman Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-5/Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1910

**Property Location:** West of Sinclair and East of Elizabeth Street

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Folk Victorian

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Subdivision

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20L.

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

**Consolidation**

The Applicant proposes to return the “through-block” configuration by presenting evidence of the originality of two parcels in question. Inman Park District regulation states when pertaining to Subarea 1 the following, “In Subarea 1, the platting pattern of the Inman Park Historic District is an integral part of the historic character of the district. No subdivision or consolidation shall be approved unless it can be shown that the proposed subdivision or consolidation is substantially consistent with the historic character of the district.”

The Applicant has provided historical data through the Cadastral Map to support the consolidation proposal. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 309 North Highland  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-21-237  
**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Inman Park Historic District **Other Zoning:** C-1

**Date of Construction:** 1950

**Property Location:** Corner of Elizabeth Street and North Highland

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Business

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Additions and alterations to existing building.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20L. and Sec. 16-11.011

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

## **Proposed Work**

The proposed work on 309 North Highland is governed by subarea 1 of Historic Inman Park as well as the C-1 regulations. This review will be subdivided so not to confuse the two requirements.

### C-1 Requirements

#### **Amenity Zone/Sidewalks**

The Applicant proposes several curb removals and sidewalk upgrades. C-1 requirements speak specifically about the sidewalk requirements that consist of amenity and walk zones. Both zones rely on the curb to properly be executed. Regulation states, “The amenity zone shall be located immediately adjacent to the curb. Width shall be measured from back (building side) of curb to the walk zone. Minimum width shall be five feet. This zone is reserved for the placement of street trees and street furniture including utility and light poles, public art, waste receptacles, fire hydrants, traffic signs, traffic control boxes,” Regulation further states for walk zones, “The walk zone shall be located immediately contiguous to the amenity zone and shall be a continuous hardscape for a minimum width of 10 feet for arterial and collector streets and six feet for all other streets. Said zones shall contain a consistent cross-slope not exceeding two percent. No fixed elements, including pole mounted signage, traffic control boxes or other utility structures, shall be placed above ground in the walk zone for a minimum height of eight feet.” The Applicant illustrated that there will be 10ft sidewalks that will allow for the street furniture, utility and light poles if need be. This is based off the Beltline requirements. While not specifically addressing the required amenity and walk zones set in the C-1 requirements, what the Applicant does will not conflict with the C-1 requirements. Staff is not concerned with proposal.

### Inman Park Regulations

The following structure has been renovated a couple of times, except for the original brick foundation, nothing else is original to the structure. The purpose of the District regulations guides the development in a manner that is conscious of the new yet respecting the historic residential area.

## **Proposal:**

### *Roof, Patio and Deck*

The Applicant proposes to install a new concrete patio over the existing which will have a flat roof with a cement fascia board with a trellis and new black-coated railings. A new deck with stair will be built where the existing deck is and will extend past the existing building, creating an overhang. The new railing isn’t problematic, in fact the railings tie the development together nicely. Staff deems the deck that extends beyond the side of the building is problematic. District Regulations states, “decks are permitted only when located to the rear of the principal structure. Such decks shall be no wider than the width of the house and shall not project beyond the side façade of the existing house.” Staff recommends the deck not extended past the building to abide by the District regulations.

### *Windows*

The Applicant proposes to remove many windows and add fix windows with grids that will match other windows on the existing building. Staff recommends, “muntins and/or mullions shall be either true divided lights or simulated divided lights with muntins integral to the sash and permanently affixed to the exterior face of glass.”

### *Siding*

The proposed sidings on the building are wood like stone siding that will sit where the address lettering will be presented; cementitious board siding near the windows; cementitious siding with a 6-inch reveal and stucco siding over the existing masonry. Staff doesn't find the sidings listed problematic except for the stucco siding over the existing masonry. The masonry would include the foundation brick that is original to this structure. Staff recommends the Applicant keep the original foundation to preserve what is left of the original building.

### *Door*

The Applicant proposes several new doors with side lites which would include divides. Staff does not find this proposal problematic.

### *Site Work*

The proposed site work under review are ADA ramp from sidewalk to patio; new ADA ramp from the deck to replace the existing; new planter with build in bench seat between the ramp and patio; new planter between the sidewalk and retaining wall; street trees 30 ft from the center. The ADA ramps are not problematic to Staff. C-1 regulations allows for trees and street furniture such as planter boxes with benches to be placed in the amenity zone. Staff would recommend the Applicant adhere to the C-1 regulations for placing the trees and planter boxes.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

- 1) The deck shall not extend pass the corner of the existing building to abide by the District regulations per, Sec.16-20L.006(1)(j);
- 2) Muntins and mullions in the windows shall be either be true divide or simulated divide with muntins integral to the sash, per Sec.16-20L.006(1)(n)(2);
- 3) The Applicant shall not add the stucco siding over all the masonry, particularly the original masonry foundation, per Sec.16-20L.001;
- 4) The Applicant shall adhere to the C-1 regulations centering on the amenity zones when planting the trees and planter boxes, per Sec.16-11.011 and
- 5) Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File





# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 678 Moreland  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-21-678  
**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Poncey-Highland Historic District    **Other Zoning:** SA-4

**Date of Construction:** 1955

**Property Location:** West of Ponce de Leon and East of Blue Ridge Avenue

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes,    **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Apartment Building

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Exterior Conversion

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20L.

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Deferred to the June 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting to allow the Applicant to provide the documents needed.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

**Purview**

The purview of the Commission is to only review the exterior conversion.

**Intent**

One of the intents of the Poncey-Highland regulations is “to preserve the district's historic development patterns characterized primarily by single-family houses, duplexes, multifamily buildings, small-scale and medium-scaled commercial buildings, and scattered industrial buildings” with this in mind the Applicant proposes to convert an existing building being used as a pre-school back to it’s original use of an apartment building.

**Conversion**

With this conversion the Applicant proposes demolishing an existing porch, stairs, windows and door on the building. The Applicant has not provided any photos to demonstrate what was previously on the building. This is problematic to Staff. Staff cannot determine if any of the proposed removals are due to them not being original to the building. Staff recommends the Applicant provide photographic evidence to support the proposal of demolishing the listed elements.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferred to the June 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

Design Studio  
Kevin Bacon  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 139 Estoria

**APPLICATION:** CA3-21-246

**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Cabbage Town Landmark District      **Other Zoning:** N/A

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location** West of Estoria and East of Kirkwood Avenue

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes,      **Building Type / Architectural form/style:**

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Addition and Alterations

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20A.

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with Conditions

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 28 and Chapter 201 of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

**COMPATIBILITY STANDARD:**

“The intent of the regulations and guidelines is to ensure that alterations to existing structures and new construction are compatible with the design, proportions, scale, massing, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face, the entire block, a particular subarea (including appropriate reference to subarea style) or the district as a whole. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The element in question (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use on that block face or, where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height and width as measured at front façade, floor height, lot dimensions, etc.), no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same architectural style and like use in that block face."

“For the purposes of the compatibility rule, height and width shall be measured at the front façade.”

**PROPOSAL**

The Applicant proposes the following to the existing structure: conversion of an attic to a loft to allow for more living space; installation of a skylight, installation of a several windows.

*Addition-loft space*

The proposed loft space will utilize an existing attic space. A rear-facing shed dormer will be installed that will tuck under the existing hip roof that should not be visible from the public right-away. From the site plan provided the new addition will not change the footprint of the existing structure and will not exceed the setbacks or lot coverage. However, the District regulations clearly defines the FAR to be no more than .50. The Applicant has not provided information of the FAR. Staff recommends the FAR be no more than .50 and be placed on the plans.

**Dormer specifics**

District regulation requires “dormers shall not occupy less than 15 percent nor more than 35 percent of the total surface area of the roof plane on which it is constructed.” According to the information provided, the Applicant appears to meet this requirement. However, Staff recommends the Applicant check the figures and drawings and comply to the District regulations regarding the dormer specifics.

***Siding***

The Applicant has proposed the siding on the new addition to be shingle. District regulations state, “siding shall exhibit a horizontal, clapboard profile. Siding shall have no less than a four-inch reveal and no more than a six-inch reveal.” Staff recommends the Applicant comply and install horizontal clapboard that has a four inch to 6-inch reveal.

***Windows installation***

Three new windows are proposed for the dormer addition. The three windows will be double hung with trim that will match the existing trim on the main structure. While these three windows will not be visible from the public-right-away, the District regulations state, “windows shall be predominantly vertical in proportion, shall not be constructed in combination of more than two units, and shall be double-hung wood sash with true divided lights. Window organization and fenestration patterns shall meet the compatibility rule.” Unless the Applicant can demonstrate

through compatibility comparisons that the three-window combination is prevalent, Staff recommends the Applicant comply to the District regulations and only install, two units.

On the existing structure, the Applicant proposes to install on the north elevation one vertical window that will match the existing windows on the structure. On the rear elevation, the proposed two windows; one vertical and one smaller window. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

*Skylight*

The proposed skylight will not be seen from the public right-away. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions**

1. The dormer shall comply to the District regulations and have a FAR no more than .50 and be less than 15 and more than 35 percent of the roof plan and put them on the final plans for submission per Sec. 16-20A.006(13)(d)(4) and Sec.16-20A.0098);
2. The Applicant shall comply to the District regulations regarding the siding on the addition and not install the shingle as proposed, Sec.16-20A.006(13)(b)(1);
3. The windows on the rear elevation shall be installed as two units to comply to the District regulation unless the Applicant can demonstrate through compatibility a three-unit construction, per Sec.16-20A.006(13)(b)(3) and
4. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 718 Lexington  
**APPLICATION:** CA3-21-249  
**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Adair Park Historic District (Subarea 1)      **Other Zoning:** R-4A/Beltline

**Date of Construction:** 1921

**Property Location:** West of Catherine Street and East of Metropolitan

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes,      **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Craftsman

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Addition and Alteration

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20I.

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

### SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance Chapter 20 and Chapter 20I of the City of Atlanta Zoning Ordinance.

## **COMPATIBILITY STANDARD**

The compatibility rule is a method of ensuring that alterations to existing structures and the design of proposed new construction are sensitive to and sympathetic toward existing elements of design, proportions, scale, massing, materials, and general character of the contributing buildings in the immediately adjacent environment of the block face. To permit flexibility, many regulations are made subject to the compatibility rule, which states: "The elements in question (roof form, architectural trim, etc.) shall match that which predominates on the contributing buildings of the same block face, or where quantifiable (i.e., buildings height and width as measured at front façade, floor height, lot dimensions, etc.), shall be no smaller than the smallest or larger than the largest such dimension of the contributing buildings of the same block face." Those elements to which the compatibility rule applies are specified in these regulations by reference to "compatibility rule."

## **DOCUMENTATION**

The Applicant has only provided a site plan that show the existing house without the propose dormers. The proposed dormers will need to be on the site plan. Staff recommends the Applicant provide a site plan that illustrates the proposed dormers or provide a separate site plan with the dormers.

Additionally, the Applicant has provided some zoning information while not providing the FAR information that is needed. Staff recommends that Applicant provide the FAR information to be placed either on site plan document or coversheet.

## **ADDITION--Dormers**

The Applicant proposes two dormers with 18 inch overhang on the right and left sides of the rear elevation to provide for more living space. Calculations indicate the 598 addition of the two domers will meet the FAR requirement of 40 % with 36%. The plans show dormers that will not exceed the roof line and slightly is recessive of the existing roofline. The dormers will have wood corbels that will match the existing gable roof on both the right and left elevations. The proposed siding on the dormers is cementitious horizontal siding. Staff is not concerned with any of the above proposal.

The proposed windows are two units double hung with lites with 8-inch lintel. However, for egress purposes the double hung will not work. The Applicant proposes 36x36 casement to meet the egress. While the District regulations states, "new doors and windows, when permitted, shall be placed on the side and rear of the structure and be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to existing windows and doors," egress requirement need to meet. Staff is not concern with the casement window proposal.

## **ALTERATIONS:**

### *Siding*

On the right elevation, the existing siding is vinyl. The Applicant proposes to install cementitious horoztional siding that will match the siding on dormers. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions.**

1. The Applicant shall provide a site plan that show the dormers or provide a separate site plan that illustrate the dormers per, Sec.16-20L.001;
2. The Applicant shall provide FAR information either on the site plan or coversheet, Sec. 16-20L.001 and
3. Staff shall review and, if appropriate, approve the final plans.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood





# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 973 Dimmock Ave.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-21-252

**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Oakland City Historic District **Other Zoning:** R-4A / Beltline.

**Date of Construction:** Vacant

**Property Location:** North block face of Dimmock St., west of the Lee St. intersection.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** N/A **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Infill

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** New Construction

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** N/A

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20, & Sec. 16-20M

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** At the March 24, 2021 public hearing the Commission reviewed and approved application CA3-21-130 for new construction at 979 Dimmock Ave. When the project was submitted for permitting, it was determined that the property address was 973 Dimmock Ave. As the previous approval is nullified by the incorrect property owner authorization, the current application has been submitted to approve the design of the new structure at the correct address.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20, & Sec. 16-20M of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

IN reviewing the project proposed at this time, Staff has confirmed that the proposed design matches the design of the project approved by the Commission for CA3-21-130. As many of the conditions of approval for CA3-21-130 have been met, Staff finds that the project more closely complies with the Oakland City Historic District regulations. However, Staff will retain many of the original conditions of approval to ensure continuity between the two applications.

The conditions of approval which were placed on CA3-21-13 by the Commission are as follows:

1. The proposed driveway shall be redrawn to extend 20' past the front façade of the proposed structure, per Sec. 16-20M.012(4)(a);
2. A compliant sidewalk shall be added to the site plan, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1)(c);
3. The Applicant shall submit compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1)(f);
4. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable building width, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1)(g);
5. The Applicant shall submit compatibility information detailing the allowable first floor height of the proposed structure, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1)(h);
6. The proposed porch rails shall be changed to meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1)(i); and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

Staff recommends the conditions of approval for CA3-21-130 be applied to the current project.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with the following conditions:**

1. The proposed driveway shall be redrawn to extend 20' past the front façade of the proposed structure, per Sec. 16-20M.012(4)(a);
2. A compliant sidewalk shall be added to the site plan, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1)(c);
3. The Applicant shall submit compatibility information detailing the allowable roof pitch, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1)(f);
4. The Applicant shall provide information detailing the allowable building width, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1)(g);
5. The Applicant shall submit compatibility information detailing the allowable first floor height of the proposed structure, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1)(h);
6. The proposed porch rails shall be changed to meet the District regulations, per Sec. 16-20M.013(1)(i); and,
7. Staff shall review and if appropriate, approve the final plans and documentation.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 1126 Arlington Ave.

**APPLICATION:** CA3-21-254 & CA2-21-253

**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Oakland City Historic District

**Other Zoning:** R-4A

**Date of Construction:** 1920

**Property Location:** Southeast corner of Arlington Ave. and Princess Ave.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes.

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Craftsman

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** A variance to allow non-conforming windows and the retention of non-conforming alterations.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** N/A

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 & Sec. 16-20M **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-21-254: Denial.**

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION CA3-21-253: Denial.**

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

**CA3-21-254**

The requested variance is to allow vinyl windows as a replacement for repairable historic windows, the replacement of repairable siding, the installation of stucco on the chimney and front porch foundation, and the installation of metal balusters on the front porch railing.

There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape or topography:

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criteria, but lists the violations on the property.

The application of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship:

The Applicant cites the cost to comply with the zoning ordinance.

Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved:

The Applicant has not provided a response to this criterion.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant states that the subject property is the only house that is remodeled and cites the property value impact of the illegal work.

Staff finds that the variance request does not meet the criteria for granting a variance. Firstly, the Applicant has not shown that there is a unique and exceptional condition with the size, shape, or topography of the site. Further, the Applicant has not shown how these conditions require non-compliant work. Further, the Applicant has not shown how their property is uniquely affected by these hardships. And lastly, the Applicant has not shown how non-compliance would not impair the purposes and intent of the zoning ordinance.

In general, Staff finds that financial concerns and the financial impact of compliance with the zoning ordinance are inadmissible as part of the variance process and cannot be used to justify a variance or satisfy the variance criterion. Further, Staff finds that the granting of the variances would negatively impact the public good as defined by the design regulations for the Oakland City Historic District. As such, Staff cannot support this variance request and recommends denial of the variance application.

**CA2-21-253**

Given Staff's determination regarding the variance criteria, Staff likewise would not support the request to revise the previously approved plans. Staff recommends denial of the application to revise the previously approved plans.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA3-21-254: Denial.**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION CA2-21-253: Denial.**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** 35 Northwood

**APPLICATION:** RC-21-239

**MEETING DATE:** August 12, 2020

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Brookwood Hills

**Other Zoning:** Conservation

**Date of Construction:** 1935

**Property Location:** West of Huntington and East of Palisades Road

**Contributing (Y/N)?** Yes, **Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Federal

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Driveway replacement

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** Interior Alterations

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec 16-20(B)

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance the Atlanta Land Development Code as amended.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the Commission confirm and send a letter with comments.

**Driveway**

The Applicant proposes to replace an existing concrete driveway in-kind to the existing. Staff is not concerned with this proposal.

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

KEVIN BACON, AIA, AICP  
Director, Office of Design

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission  
**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director  
**ADDRESS:** 133 Peachtree St.  
**APPLICATION:** RC-21-250  
**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** N/A **Other Zoning:** SPI-1 (Subarea 7)

**Date of Construction:** N/A

**Property Location:** Northeast corner of Peachtree St. and John Wesley Dobbs Ave.

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes.

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Plaza.

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Installation of public art.

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** N/A

**Relevant Code Sections:** Sec. 16-20 **Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No.

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** N/A

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Confirm the delivery of comments.

RC-21-250 at 133 Peachtree St.

June 6, 2021

Page 2 of 2

**CONCLUSIONS:** The following conclusions pertinent to this request are in accordance with Sec. 16-20 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Atlanta.

The Applicant proposes the installation of sculptures on the subject property. IN looking at the proposal, Staff has no general concerns but suggests the Applicant detail their studies regarding the impact on pedestrian traffic. Staff further suggests the Applicant discuss who will be responsible for the maintenance of the piece and whether a routine schedule for upkeep will be created.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.**

cc: Applicant  
Neighborhood  
File





# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** Various Addresses

**APPLICATION:** RC-21-266

**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Zoned Variously

**Other Zoning:** Zoned Variously

**Date of Construction:** Dates of construction range between 1900s to 2000s

**Property Location:** Various Locations

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes, some

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Various

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Review of Proposed In-Rem Demolition Actions for the December, 2019; January, 2020; and February, 2020 In Rem Public Hearings: 32 Historic / Contributing Properties and 7 Non-Historic / Non-Contributing Property

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** N/A

**Relevant Code Sections:** Section 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** None

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The subject properties were recommended for demolition by the City of Atlanta's In Rem Review Board at its December, 2019; January, 2020; and February, 2020 meetings. The properties are located across the City in various zoning categories, some in National Register of Historic Places-eligible neighborhoods and National Register-listed neighborhoods.

Through the Administration In Rem proceeding set forth in Article III, Section 30 of the Atlanta Housing Code, the Atlanta Police Department-Code Enforcement Section can proceed with demolition or clean and close action against private property. When a property owner fails to bring his/her property into compliance with the Atlanta Housing Code or the Atlanta Commercial Institutional Building Maintenance Code, a review/inspection of such property is conducted by the Code Enforcement staff to determine if the property (structure) is eligible for demolition or clean and close abatement.

Generally, properties that are unsecured, fire damaged, collapsing, or severely dilapidated are eligible for In Rem proceedings. However, the Atlanta Housing Code states any property (structure) that cannot be repaired at cost less than 50% of the value (exclusive of foundation and lot) it can be demolished. If the structure can be repaired at less than 50% of the value (exclusive of foundations and lot) it can be cleaned and closed.

Once the inspection assessment (determination of demolition or clean and close) of such properties is completed, an In Rem hearing is scheduled and evidence is put forth before the In Rem Review Board. Evidence includes, but not limited to, the number of complaints filed with the APD-Code Enforcement Section, the types of violations noted, the progression of notification to property owner(s), photographs, and the inspection assessment.

When an Order of demolition or clean and close is issued by the In Rem Review Board, the APD-Code Enforcement Section has authorization to access that private property and abate the nuisance. Once the abatement is completed, a lien is filed against the property for the cost of the abatement.

While the Staff is always concerned about the loss of historic or potentially historic buildings in the City of Atlanta, the properties in the In Rem review process are either in very poor condition, the City is unable to find the legitimate property owner, or the property owner cannot or will not address the situation. Further, the properties have often been in the City of Atlanta's code compliance system for some time meaning that there have been additional opportunities at which the property was made aware of the problems and given an opportunity to address the situation.

Further, the Staff finds that given the volume of properties proposed for demolition, digital images of a representative sample of the properties in the best condition should be prepared and retained by the Code Enforcement Section of the Atlanta Police Department and the Office of Design's historic preservation staff.

Based on the information provided to date by the Code Enforcement Staff, the Staff would suggest the following 11 properties have digital images prepared and retained by the Code Enforcement Staff:

Street Address		# of Units	Year Built	Neighborhood Name
1111	5th Street NW	1	1945	Carey Park
1480	Donald Lee Hollowell Pkwy NW	1	1940	Grove Park
480	Elm Street NW	1	1930	English Avenue
1571	Ezra Church NW	1	1963	West Lake
643	Grady Place SW	1	1920	West End
1871	Lakewood Avenue SE	1	1910	Lakewood Heights
117	Lamar Avenue NW	multiple	1956	Dixie Hills
562	Moreland Avenue SE	1	1925	East Atlanta
1256	Oakland Terrace SW	1	1930	Oakland City
25	Stillman Street SE	1	1930	Lakewood Heights
124	Wadley Street NW	multiple	1956	Dixie Hills

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission deliver comments at the meeting regarding Review and Comment (RC-21-266) for In-Rem demolition applications from December, 2019; January, 2020; and February, 2020 In Rem hearings.

cc: Applicant  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** Various Addresses

**APPLICATION:** RC-21-267

**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Zoned Variously

**Other Zoning:** Zoned Variously

**Date of Construction:** Dates of construction range between 1900s to 2000s

**Property Location:** Various Locations

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes, some

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Various

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Review of Proposed In-Rem Demolition Actions for the October, 2020; November, 2020; and December, 2020 In Rem Public Hearings: 79 Historic / Contributing Properties and 20 Non-Historic / Non-Contributing Property

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** N/A

**Relevant Code Sections:** Section 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** None

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The subject properties were recommended for demolition by the City of Atlanta's In Rem Review Board at its October, 2020; November, 2020, and December, 2020 meetings. The properties are located across the City in various zoning categories, some in National Register of Historic Places-eligible neighborhoods and National Register-listed neighborhoods.

Through the Administration In Rem proceeding set forth in Article III, Section 30 of the Atlanta Housing Code, the Atlanta Police Department-Code Enforcement Section can proceed with demolition or clean and close action against private property. When a property owner fails to bring his/her property into compliance with the Atlanta Housing Code or the Atlanta Commercial Institutional Building Maintenance Code, a review/inspection of such property is conducted by the Code Enforcement staff to determine if the property (structure) is eligible for demolition or clean and close abatement.

Generally, properties that are unsecured, fire damaged, collapsing, or severely dilapidated are eligible for In Rem proceedings. However, the Atlanta Housing Code states any property (structure) that cannot be repaired at cost less than 50% of the value (exclusive of foundation and lot) it can be demolished. If the structure can be repaired at less than 50% of the value (exclusive of foundations and lot) it can be cleaned and closed.

Once the inspection assessment (determination of demolition or clean and close) of such properties is completed, an In Rem hearing is scheduled and evidence is put forth before the In Rem Review Board. Evidence includes, but not limited to, the number of complaints filed with the APD-Code Enforcement Section, the types of violations noted, the progression of notification to property owner(s), photographs, and the inspection assessment.

When an Order of demolition or clean and close is issued by the In Rem Review Board, the APD-Code Enforcement Section has authorization to access that private property and abate the nuisance. Once the abatement is completed, a lien is filed against the property for the cost of the abatement.

While the Staff is always concerned about the loss of historic or potentially historic buildings in the City of Atlanta, the properties in the In Rem review process are either in very poor condition, the City is unable to find the legitimate property owner, or the property owner cannot or will not address the situation. Further, the properties have often been in the City of Atlanta's code compliance system for some time meaning that there have been additional opportunities at which the property was made aware of the problems and given an opportunity to address the situation.

Further, the Staff finds that given the volume of properties proposed for demolition, digital images of a representative sample of the properties in the best condition should be prepared and retained by the Code Enforcement Section of the Atlanta Police Department and the Office of Design's historic preservation staff.

Based on the information provided to date by the Code Enforcement Staff, the Staff would suggest the following 22 properties have digital images prepared and retained by the Code Enforcement Staff:

Street Address		# of Units	Year Built	Neighborhood Name
3163	Browns Mill Road, SE	1	1930	Glenrose Heights
1724	Donald Lee Hollowell Prkwy AKA Bankdhead Hwy	1	1940	Grove Park
1103	Hubbard Street, SW	1	1925	Pittsburgh
1162	Hubbard Street, SW	1	1925	Pittsburgh
2222	Springdale Circle, SW	1	1953	Perkerson
4395	Bakers Ferry Road SW	1	1962	Bakers Ferry
141	Berean Street, SE	1	1920	Cabbagetown
131	Claire Drive, SE	1	1925	Lakewood Heights
964	Coleman Street SW	1	1920	Pittsburgh
642	Lawton Street SW	1	1930	West End
537	Marttwo Place, NW	1	1938	Grove Park
984	McDaniel Street SW	1	1920	Pittsburgh
329	Troy Street SE	1	1950	Lakewood Heights
2705	Baker Ridge Drive NW	1	1945	Colliier Heights
2286	Carver Drive NW	1	1950	Dixie Hills
766	Constitution Road SE	1	1945	Norwood Manor
600	Memorial Drive SE	1	1952	Cabbagetown
1424	Westboro Drive SW	1	1950	Oakland City
1034	Dill Avenue SW	1	1945	Capitol View
946	Hollywood Road NW	1	1930	Grove Park
1105	Philadelphia Avenue SW	1	1950	Cascade Avenue/Road
220	Sunset Avenue NW	1	1954	Vine City

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission deliver comments at the meeting regarding Review and Comment (RC-21-267) for In-Rem demolition applications from October, 2020; November, 2020, and December, 2020 In Rem hearings.

cc: Applicant  
File



# CITY OF ATLANTA

KEISHA LANCE BOTTOMS  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING  
55 Trinity Avenue, S.W. SUITE 3350 – ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0308  
404-330-6145 – FAX: 404-658-7491  
[www.atlantaga.gov](http://www.atlantaga.gov)

TIM KEANE  
Commissioner

OFFICE OF DESIGN

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Atlanta Urban Design Commission

**FROM:** Doug Young, Executive Director

**ADDRESS:** Various Addresses

**APPLICATION:** RC-21-268

**MEETING DATE:** June 9, 2021

---

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

**Historic Zoning:** Zoned Variously

**Other Zoning:** Zoned Variously

**Date of Construction:** Dates of construction range between 1900s to 2000s

**Property Location:** Various Locations

**Contributing (Y/N)?:** Yes, some

**Building Type / Architectural form/style:** Various

**Project Components Subject to Review by the Commission:** Review of Proposed In-Rem Demolition Actions for the January, 2021; February, 2021; and March, 2021 In Rem Public Hearings: 45 Historic / Contributing Properties and 6 Non-Historic / Non-Contributing Property

**Project Components NOT Subject to Review by the Commission:** N/A

**Relevant Code Sections:** Section 6-4043 of the Atlanta City Code

**Deferred Application (Y/N)?:** No

**Previous Applications/Known Issues:** None

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:** Confirm the delivery of comments at the meeting.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The subject properties were recommended for demolition by the City of Atlanta's In Rem Review Board at its January, 2021; February, 2021; and March, 2021 meetings. The properties are located across the City in various zoning categories, some in National Register of Historic Places-eligible neighborhoods and National Register-listed neighborhoods.

Through the Administration In Rem proceeding set forth in Article III, Section 30 of the Atlanta Housing Code, the Atlanta Police Department-Code Enforcement Section can proceed with demolition or clean and close action against private property. When a property owner fails to bring his/her property into compliance with the Atlanta Housing Code or the Atlanta Commercial Institutional Building Maintenance Code, a review/inspection of such property is conducted by the Code Enforcement staff to determine if the property (structure) is eligible for demolition or clean and close abatement.

Generally, properties that are unsecured, fire damaged, collapsing, or severely dilapidated are eligible for In Rem proceedings. However, the Atlanta Housing Code states any property (structure) that cannot be repaired at cost less than 50% of the value (exclusive of foundation and lot) it can be demolished. If the structure can be repaired at less than 50% of the value (exclusive of foundations and lot) it can be cleaned and closed.

Once the inspection assessment (determination of demolition or clean and close) of such properties is completed, an In Rem hearing is scheduled and evidence is put forth before the In Rem Review Board. Evidence includes, but not limited to, the number of complaints filed with the APD-Code Enforcement Section, the types of violations noted, the progression of notification to property owner(s), photographs, and the inspection assessment.

When an Order of demolition or clean and close is issued by the In Rem Review Board, the APD-Code Enforcement Section has authorization to access that private property and abate the nuisance. Once the abatement is completed, a lien is filed against the property for the cost of the abatement.

While the Staff is always concerned about the loss of historic or potentially historic buildings in the City of Atlanta, the properties in the In Rem review process are either in very poor condition, the City is unable to find the legitimate property owner, or the property owner cannot or will not address the situation. Further, the properties have often been in the City of Atlanta's code compliance system for some time meaning that there have been additional opportunities at which the property was made aware of the problems and given an opportunity to address the situation.

Further, the Staff finds that given the volume of properties proposed for demolition, digital images of a representative sample of the properties in the best condition should be prepared and retained by the Code Enforcement Section of the Atlanta Police Department and the Office of Design's historic preservation staff.

Based on the information provided to date by the Code Enforcement Staff, the Staff would suggest the following 13 properties have digital images prepared and retained by the Code Enforcement Staff:



Street Address		# of Units	Year Built	Neighborhood Name
530	James P. Brawley Drive NW	1	1920	English Avenue
459	Joseph E Lowery Blvd NW	1	1925	English Avenue
979	Linam Street Street SE	1	1920	Peopletown
1102	McDaniel Street SW	1	1930	Pittsburgh
1176	Booker Avenue SW	1	TBD	Pittsburgh
1007	Ira Street SW	1	1920	Pittsburgh
242	James P. Brawley Drive NW	1	1930	Vine City
793	Laurelmont Drive SW	1	1955	West Manor
1864	Markone Street NW	1	1948	Grove Park
370	Tazor Street NW	1	1935	Historic Westin Heights/Bankhead
888	COLEMAN STREET SW	1	1920	Pittsburgh
762	COOPER STREET SW	1	1920	Mechanicsville
646	PEARCE STREET SW	1	1930	Adair Park
1109	WINDSOR STREET SW	1	1920	Pittsburgh

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission deliver comments at the meeting regarding Review and Comment (RC-21-268) for In-Rem demolition applications from January, 2021; February, 2021, and March, 2021 In Rem hearings.

cc: Applicant  
File